

6.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

6.1 Rationale for Alternative Selection

CEQA requires the consideration of alternative development scenarios and the analysis of impacts associated with the alternatives. Comparing these alternatives to the proposed project, the advantages of each alternative can be analyzed and evaluated. Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR:

“describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.”

Additionally, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 states in part:

An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather, it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives that are infeasible (15126.6(a)).

The range of potential alternatives to the proposed project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. The EIR should briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed. The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency’s determination.

Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts (15126.6(c)).

The specific alternative of “No Project” shall also be evaluated along with its impact (15126.6(e)(1)).

If the environmentally superior alternative is the “No Project” alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives (15126.6(e)(2)). A comparison of the proposed alternatives is presented in Table 6-1.

6.1.1 Alternatives Considered but Rejected from Further Detailed Analysis

6.1.1.1 Open Space Alternative

The Open Space Alternative assumes that the project development area would remain in its current state with the existing residential, commercial, and light industrial uses, and undeveloped parcels. No development would be proposed on the remaining undeveloped parcels of the Ponto Area; however, the undeveloped areas of the site would be preserved as dedicated open space for habitat preservation and/or potential recreational use. The Ponto Area would be rezoned as Open Space and amendments to the General Plan and LCP would be required. An open space easement would be dedicated over the undeveloped areas to

ensure that this acreage remained in perpetuity as the intended use. Recreational uses may include interpretive hiking trails or bike paths that would provide a linkage to other trails in the area. Other passive activities such as picnicking may also be permitted.

This alternative would reduce impacts to traffic, air quality, and noise as compared to the proposed project, as no additional development on the site would occur, thereby reducing resultant vehicle trips and emissions as compared to the proposed project. In addition, biological impacts would also be reduced, as no sensitive species or habitat would be impacted by future development activities on the undeveloped parcels, since they would be preserved as open space for the long-term. Visual impacts, while not significant under the proposed project, would be reduced because there would be no new development.

Almost all of the property within the area affected by the Vision Plan is privately owned and currently zoned to allow for development. Under the existing zoning, none of the ownerships within the 50-acre Ponto Area are intended for open space, habitat preservation, or long-term biological management. Under this alternative, the existing development would remain, and individual landowners of the undeveloped parcels would not be allowed to propose development or improvements on their property as desired. The City would likely be required to enter an eminent domain process with the current landowners to acquire the open space.

Although this alternative would achieve the SCCRA Plan's goal of developing new beach and coastal recreational opportunities, the majority of the other goals established by the Plan would not be obtained. By preserving the undeveloped areas of the site as open space, the following goals would not be achieved: (1) assembling of land into parcels for modern, integrated development with improved pedestrian and vehicular circulation in the Project Area; (2) rezoning, redesigning and developing properties which are stagnant or improperly utilized; (3) increase, improve and preserve the City's supply of housing affordable to very low, low and moderate income utilized; (4) eliminate blight and environmental efficiencies in the Project Area; and, (5) increase parking and open space amenities. In addition, this alternative would not meet the goals of the Vision Plan or the General Plan for development of this area.

In addition, the Open Space Alternative fails to achieve the majority of the objectives of the Vision Plan. This alternative would not meet the goals of establishing a mixed-use district that encourages local and tourist-oriented retail, commercial, recreational and residential uses, or accommodating a mix of local and tourist-serving commercial, medium- and high-density residential, mixed use, live/work, and open space land use opportunities that are economically viable and support the implementation of these goals. In addition, this alternative would not establish the Southern Coastal Gateway to the City, as no improvements would be made to signify such an entry point. As this alternative would not meet these and other objectives, this alternative is not considered a viable option and was rejected from further analysis.

6.1.1.2 *Alternate Location Alternative*

The Alternate Location Alternative assumes that the intent and guidelines given in the Vision Plan will be applied to an alternative location within the City of Carlsbad. Alternate locations considered included properties both within and outside of the SCCRA.

Although other land is available within the SCCRA, the Ponto Area represents an area with large, undeveloped acreage where the existing General Plan, zoning designations and Local Coastal Program would allow for the uses proposed in the Vision Plan. Under the existing zoning, a mixed-use district that encourages local and tourist-oriented retail, commercial, recreational, and residential uses could be developed. In addition, the proposed site's proximity to the State Beach allows for the opportunity to supplement and enhance existing recreational and scenic resources within the City, consistent with the goals of the Vision Plan. The proposed project site also represents an opportunity to establish and enhance the entry corridor into southern Carlsbad, creating a Southern Coastal Gateway to the City, and thereby controlling potential visual impacts that may result if parcels within 50-acre area were developed individually without the design guidelines given in the Vision Plan.

By proposing development of the Vision Plan uses at an alternate location within the SCRRRA, it can be assumed that impacts to traffic, air, and noise would be similar to that of the proposed project, as similar uses would be proposed and thereby, a similar number of vehicle trips would be generated (although potentially at different locations and therefore, different traffic distribution patterns may result). Impacts to biological resources may be increased as compared to the proposed project depending on alternative site, as a large portion of the project site is currently either developed or disturbed, with limited sensitive biological resources.

Opportunities for an alternate site outside of the SCRRRA, within the City of Carlsbad, were also analyzed. However, due to the uses intended with the Vision Plan, an available site (or combination of parcels) of adequate size was not identified. In addition, this alternative would not achieve the objective of providing expanded beach access, as another site of adequate size to support the uses proposed while providing proximity to the beach was not identified within the City of Carlsbad. This alternative would also not establish the Southern Coastal Gateway to the City, as the Ponto Area includes the southernmost coastal property within the City of Carlsbad. Therefore, the opportunity to achieve the goal of enhancing the major entryway into the City at the southerly boundary would not be an option at an alternate location.

In addition, a site outside of the SCCRA would not achieve the SCCRA's Plan to eliminate blight and environmental deficiencies in the Ponto Area or develop new beach and coastal recreational opportunities. In addition, the Carlsbad Boulevard re-alignment that would yield excess property to facilitate expansion of the Carlsbad State Beach campgrounds and/or provide for other recreational facilities would not occur if an alternate site were selected.

The Alternate Location Alternative would not achieve many of the objectives and goals of the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan or the SCCRA Plan. Therefore, this alternative is rejected from further analysis.

6.2 Analysis of the No Development Alternative

6.2.1 No Development Alternative Description and Setting

The No Development Alternative assumes that the project site would not be developed with the proposed project. The project site would remain in its present condition and would continue to support the existing single-family residential and small-scale commercial and light-industrial uses. No on-site or off-site roadway improvements, including Carlsbad

Boulevard, would occur with this alternative. Although this alternative is similar to the Open Space Alternative, preservation of the undeveloped portions of the Ponto Area would not be guaranteed for the long-term through zoning or dedication of an open space easement.

6.2.2 Comparison of the Effects of the No Development Alternative to the Proposed Project

6.2.2.1 *Air Quality*

As the No Development Alternative would not result in development of the site, the uses proposed with the Vision Plan would not be developed, thereby reducing the number of vehicle trips generated by uses on the property. Therefore, the No Development Alternative would result in an incremental reduction in air quality impacts as compared to the proposed project. In addition, grading of the site would not be required, thereby incrementally reducing air quality impacts associated with operation of heavy construction equipment as compared to the proposed project. Therefore, impacts on air quality under the No Development Alternative would be reduced as compared to the project.

6.2.2.2 *Biological Resources*

As no additional development would occur with this alternative, disturbed areas on the site would remain in their present state as undeveloped land. This alternative would not propose to preserve on-site habitat through dedication of open space lots or within a dedicated easement; however, as no development would occur on the site, potential impacts to biological resources both on and off the site would not occur. Impacts to biological resources under the No Development Alternative would be avoided and therefore, reduced as compared to the proposed project.

6.2.2.3 *Cultural Resources*

As no development would take place on the site under this alternative, potential impacts caused by disturbance to undiscovered cultural resources during grading or construction activities would not occur. Mitigation in the form of monitoring during such activities would therefore not be required. Therefore, potential impacts to cultural resources would be reduced with the No Development Alternative as compared to the proposed project.

6.2.2.4 *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*

With this alternative, the site would remain in its present state, with the existing residential, commercial and light industrial uses remaining. This alternative would not result in additional housing or development on the site that could potentially expose persons to the risk of hazardous materials; however, existing conditions on the site would remain, wherein continued exposure of current residents to potentially hazardous materials identified during the Phase I ESA would continue. The potential for impacts resulting from hazards or hazardous materials under the No Development Alternative would be reduced as compared to the proposed project.

6.2.2.5 *Noise*

As no improvements would occur on the site under the No Development Alternative, noise generated by temporary construction or grading activities would not occur. In addition, as no residential or hotel units would be constructed, and noise potentially generated by the operation of commercial uses, such as vehicular activity or delivery truck activity, would not occur. Therefore, noise impacts under this alternative would be reduced as compared to the proposed project.

6.2.2.6 *Traffic and Circulation*

As compared to the proposed project, this alternative would not result in the construction of new residential units or commercial uses that would generate additional vehicular trips along area roadways. As stated above, no additional on-site or off-site roadway improvements would occur with this alternative. Therefore, impacts to traffic and circulation under the No Development Alternative would be reduced as compared to the proposed project.

6.2.2.7 *Visual Aesthetics and Grading*

As compared to the proposed project, impacts to visual resources would be less than significant. No improvements would be made to enhance the scenic corridor, and as no development would occur and current uses on the site would remain, there would be no changes to the existing conditions on-site. Therefore, visual impacts would be reduced as compared to the proposed project.

6.2.2.8 *Agricultural Resources*

As compared to the proposed project, impacts to agricultural resources would be less than significant. However, no conversion of former agricultural lands would occur. Therefore, impacts to agricultural resources would be reduced as compared to the proposed project.

6.2.2.9 *Geology and Soils*

As compared to the proposed project, impacts to geology and soils resources would be less than significant. Therefore, impacts to geology and soils would be the same as compared to the proposed project.

6.2.2.10 *Hydrology and Water Quality*

As with the proposed project, this alternative would not result in a significant impact on existing hydrology and water quality. The site would remain in its present state and no alteration of the site or other surface features would occur. However, no Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be implemented and no drainage improvements would occur. Surface water runoff would continue to leave the site untreated as it presently does, potentially resulting in impacts on hydrology and water quality. As a result, potential impacts on hydrology and water quality are considered to be greater under this alternative as compared to the proposed project.

6.2.2.11 Land Use

As with the proposed project, land use impacts would be less than significant under this alternative. As no development would occur, and current uses on the site would remain, no revisions to the existing land use or zoning designations would be required. Therefore, land use and planning impacts would be reduced as compared to the proposed project.

6.2.2.12 Public Utilities and Service Systems

As with the proposed project, this alternative would not result in significant impacts on utilities or public services. However, under the No Development Alternative, a lesser demand would be placed on existing or future utility systems and public services, as no development would occur on the site, and new residents and recreational commercial uses would not require public water or sewer or other services, such as law enforcement or fire service protection. Therefore, this alternative is considered to reduce impacts on utilities and service systems as compared to the proposed project.

6.2.3 Rationale for Preference of Proposed Project over the No Development Alternative

The No Development Alternative would reduce or avoid all of the impacts associated with the proposed project, with the exception of hydrology and water quality, as BMPs to control drainage from the site would not be implemented. Therefore, the No Development Alternative is considered to be the Environmentally Superior Alternative. However, this alternative does not meet any of the project objectives, such as establishing the Southern Coastal Gateway to the City or providing a balanced and cohesive mix of local and tourist-serving commercial, medium- and high-density residential, mixed use, live/work, and open space land use opportunities that would be economically viable. In addition, this alternative would not establish a pattern of pedestrian and bicycle accessibility that would link with adjacent existing and planned pedestrian and bicycle facilities, or establish a mixed-use district that encourages local and tourist-oriented retail, commercial, recreational and residential uses.

6.3 Analysis of the No Project Alternative

The analysis of the No Project Alternative is required under CEQA Guidelines. As set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2), the No Project analysis shall discuss the existing conditions at the time the Notice of Preparation is published and “what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.” Section 15126.6(e)((3)(B) adds that, for a development project on identifiable property, the No Project alternative is the circumstance under which the project does not proceed, and “the discussion would compare the environmental effects of the property remaining in its existing state against environmental effects that would occur if the project is approved.”

6.3.1 No Project Alternative Description and Setting

Under the No Project Alternative, the Vision Plan development area would be developed as allowed under the current General Plan land use and zoning designations without special permitting. As the proposed project does not propose a change to the underlying General

Plan or zoning, and would allow the same uses as those allowed under the existing General Plan designations and zoning, as well as the underlying Specific Plans (Poinsettia Properties Specific Plan and the Poinsettia Shores Master Plan), uses developed under the No Project Alternative would be similar to that proposed with the Vision Plan; however, the Vision Plan envisions uses that would actually result in a decreased intensity than that allowed under the existing land use designations. The No Project Alternative would allow the property to be developed with travel/recreational commercial, medium-high residential uses, or as open space or parks.

In the southern portion of the site, the existing General Plan designation would allow for travel and recreational commercial uses, such as hotels, restaurants, and commercial retail, to enhance the tourism and recreational opportunities in the City. In the northern portion of the site, residential housing could be provided at a density of 8-15 dwelling units per acre, or in combination with travel and recreational commercial uses. Areas that are currently designated as unplanned may require further planning to determine appropriate uses.

Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would ultimately contribute to off-site road improvements as applicable, to mitigate for future potential traffic impacts caused by vehicular trips generated by on-site uses. This alternative could also propose on-site trails and linkage to the regional trail system for recreational use. In addition, improvements would be made, consistent with the Zone 9 and 22 LFMPs, to provide public water and sewer service to the site. Development on-site would be consistent with the Scenic Corridor Guidelines and would contribute to improvements along Carlsbad Boulevard, but would not result in an overall themed design approach that would establish and enhance a major entryway into the City of Carlsbad.

6.3.2 Comparison of the Effects of the No Project Alternative to the Proposed Project

6.3.2.1 *Air Quality*

The No Project Alternative could generate a greater number of vehicle trips as developed to its potential under the existing land use and zoning designations, thereby incrementally increasing air quality impacts. Although a greater intensity of uses is assumed under this alternative, grading requirements for building pads, as well as the time period heavy equipment would be in operation, would likely be similar to that of the proposed project. Therefore, due to additional traffic generation, impacts on air quality under the No Project Alternative would be increased as compared to the proposed project.

6.3.2.2 *Biological Resources*

With the No Project Alternative, impacts on biological resources would be similar as compared to the proposed project. Although the use of the site is assumed to be more intense under the No Project Alternative, the development footprint would remain largely the same. In addition, grading required for the development of the site would be roughly the same; therefore, potential biological impacts to sensitive resources resulting from noise generated by heavy equipment would be similar with this alternative. Other potential impacts, such as night lighting and threats from domesticated pets, would also be similar. Therefore, with the No Project Alternative, impacts on biological resources would be similar as compared to the proposed project.

6.3.2.3 *Cultural Resources*

As similar development would take place on the site under this alternative, potential impacts caused by disturbance to undiscovered cultural resources during grading or construction activities would be similar to that of the proposed project. Mitigation in the form of monitoring during such activities would be required. Therefore, potential impacts to cultural resources would be similar with the No Project Alternative as compared to the proposed project.

6.3.2.4 *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*

With this alternative, the site would be developed with uses allowed under the existing zoning and General Plan land use designations, which would include residential, commercial and tourism-oriented uses. The existing residential, commercial and light industrial uses would be allowed to remain. This alternative would result in additional housing or development on the site that could potentially expose persons to the risk of hazardous materials. Additional analysis of the site in the form of a Phase II ESA may be required to further assess potentially hazardous materials identified during the Phase I ESA. The potential for impacts resulting from hazards or hazardous materials under the No Project Alternative would be similar as compared to the proposed project.

6.3.2.5 *Noise*

With this alternative, noise impacts would be increased as compared to the project, as a more intense development of the site could potentially occur. This alternative would generate construction noise similar to the proposed project because the same type of construction equipment would be used; however, long-term noise impacts are assumed to be incrementally greater than the proposed project due to increased intensity in use of the site (i.e. more delivery trucks, mechanical equipment, etc.). As a result, similar mitigation measures to those required for the proposed project would be required as part of this alternative to reduce potential noise impacts. Therefore, noise impacts would be greater with the No Project Alternative as compared to the proposed project.

6.3.2.6 *Traffic and Circulation*

The No Project Alternative could result in increased traffic and circulation impacts as compared to the proposed project, depending on the ultimate buildout of the project area. Please see Table 5.6-3 in Section 5.6 of this EIR. Table 5.6-3 calculates the potential traffic generation that could occur under the existing General Plan designations. As the Vision Plan proposes a less intense development of the site than that which would be allowed under the existing General Plan designations, traffic generated by development of the site under the No Project Alternative would be greater. Access would occur from the same points as under the proposed project (Avenida Encinas and Ponto Road and Beach Way). Traffic generated under this alternative would utilize the same roadways as the proposed project; however, impacts to these roadways would be greater with the increase in vehicles trips generated by the more intense use of the site, thereby increasing significant impacts on these roadways over that resulting from the proposed project. Mitigation in the form of improvements to these roadways and intersections would be similar to that required of the proposed project.

Therefore, the No Project Alternative would result in increased impacts to traffic and circulation as compared to the proposed project.

6.3.2.7 *Visual Aesthetics and Grading*

Under this alternative, impacts on landform and visual aesthetics would be similar as compared to the proposed project, as the development area and potential uses would be similar. Development would be subject to the City's Scenic Corridor Guidelines and the requirements of the Landscape Design Manual to reduce the potential for visual impacts to occur. Mitigation in the form of landscaping manufactured slopes and screening of retaining walls would be required. However, there would be no plan for a cohesive mix of landscaping and architecture or adopted design guidelines. Therefore, potential visual impacts would be greater under this alternative.

6.3.2.8 *Agricultural Resources*

As compared to the proposed project, impacts to agricultural resources would be less than significant. Therefore, impacts to agricultural resources would be the same as compared to the project.

6.3.2.9 *Geology and Soils*

Similar to the proposed project, no significant impacts relating to geologic resources would occur under this alternative. Although additional grading of on-site soils may be required due to a potential increase in the number of units or square footage of development, grading would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, or increase exposure of residents to the risk of landslides or earthquakes. As such, potential impacts from geological resources under this alternative would be similar to that of the proposed project.

6.3.2.10 *Hydrology and Water Quality*

As with the proposed project, this alternative would not result in a significant impact on hydrology or water quality. The amount of impervious surfaces on the site would be similar with the No Project Alternative as compared to the project in terms of driveways and roadways, and the development footprint is assumed to also be similar. Required stormwater facilities would be adjusted accordingly. Similar design measures and BMPs required for the proposed project would be required for this alternative to minimize potential water quality impacts. Therefore, impacts to water quality and hydrology would be similar as compared to the proposed project.

6.3.2.11 *Land Use and Planning*

As with the proposed project, no significant land use impacts would occur with this alternative. The No Project Alternative would be consistent with applicable land use plans and zoning, as development of the site would occur under the current land use and zoning designations. Therefore, land use impacts under this alternative would be similar to the proposed project and no mitigation would be required.

6.3.2.12 Public Utilities and Public Service Systems

As with the proposed project, this alternative would not result in significant impacts on utilities or public services, as all development would be consistent with the requirements of the LFMPs for Zones 9 and 22. However, under the No Project Alternative, it is assumed that a greater demand would be placed on existing or future utility systems and public services, as a greater number of residential units or greater intensity of commercial uses could occur, thereby incrementally increasing the demand for public water and sewer and other services, such as law enforcement and fire service protection, and educational services at local schools. Therefore, this alternative would increase impacts on public utilities and service systems as compared to the proposed project.

6.3.3 Rationale for Preference of the Proposed Project over the No Project Alternative

Like the proposed project, this alternative would be consistent with all land use plans and zoning, and would reflect the type of development originally intended for the site under the General Plan. However, with the No Project Alternative, impacts to traffic and circulation, noise, utilities and public service systems, as well as air quality, would be greater than the proposed project, due to the potential increase in the number of proposed residential units or square footage of development.

This alternative would meet the objective of conforming with the General Plan, Amended Zone 9 and 22 Local Facilities Management Plans (LFMP), applicable City ordinances, regulations and policies. This alternative would also meet the objective of establishing a mixed-use district that encourages local and tourist-oriented retail, commercial, recreational and residential uses, as such uses would be allowed under the existing land use and zoning designations. This alternative would also be required to assure that public facilities and services meet the requirements of the Growth Management Plan.

However, this alternative would not achieve the project objectives of establishing the Southern Coastal Gateway to the City or providing site design guidelines that require street scenes and site plans to respect pedestrian scale and express a cohesive and high-quality architectural theme. In addition, this alternative would not provide for expanded and enhanced beach access, or establish a mixed-use district that encourages local and tourist-oriented retail, commercial, recreational and residential uses. This alternative would also not achieve the objective of requiring landowners within the project development area to utilize landscape architecture that celebrates the historic past and horticultural heritage of the City, thereby reinforcing an overall theme. Expanded and enhanced beach access would also not be provided.

6.4 Analysis of the Increased Residential Use Alternative

6.4.1 Increased Residential Use Alternative Description and Setting

The Increased Residential Land Use Alternative assumes that the majority of the project site would be developed with townhomes, at a density of 19 du/acre; refer to Figure 6-2. At this density, an estimated 352 townhomes could be constructed. In addition, the Resort Hotel and Hotel/Commercial uses would also be developed, similar to the proposed project. No Mixed-Use or Live-Work/Mixed-Use uses would be developed, thereby minimizing commercial retail or tourism-oriented uses. This alternative would not result in improvements associated

with the State Beach, nor include enhancements to the major entryway into the City at Carlsbad Boulevard and Batiquitos Lagoon.

6.4.2 Comparison of the Effects of the Increased Residential Use Alternative to the Proposed Project

6.4.2.1 *Air Quality*

The Increased Residential Use Alternative would generate fewer vehicle trips than the proposed project as the result of the elimination of the mixed-use commercial and Village Hotel uses, and would therefore result in an incremental decrease in air quality impacts resulting from vehicle emissions. Therefore, impacts to air quality under this alternative would be reduced as compared to the proposed project.

6.4.2.2 *Biological Resources*

With this alternative, impacts on biological resources would be similar as compared to the proposed project. The development footprint would remain largely the same, as the majority of the site would be assumed to be impacted. In addition, grading required for the proposed uses and project roadways would be roughly the same; therefore, potential biological impacts to sensitive resources resulting from noise generated by heavy equipment during grading and construction activities would be similar with this alternative. Other potential impacts, such as night lighting and threats from domesticated pets, would also be similar. Therefore, with the Increased Residential Use Alternative, impacts on biological resources would be similar as compared to the proposed project.

6.4.2.3 *Cultural Resources*

Potential impacts caused by disturbance to undiscovered cultural resources during grading or construction activities would be similar to that of the proposed project. Mitigation in the form of monitoring during grading activities would therefore be required. Therefore, potential impacts to cultural resources would be similar as compared to the Increased Residential Alternative as compared to the proposed project.

6.4.2.4 *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*

Similar to the proposed project, the existing residential and commercial uses would remain on-site with this alternative. As such, future residents and visitors to the site would be exposed to potentially hazardous conditions such as contaminated soils or chemicals utilized on the site. As such, additional site assessment would be required under this alternative to determine the extent of potential impacts due to the exposure of humans to such conditions. Therefore, impacts related to hazards and hazardous conditions would be similar to the proposed project under this alternative.

6.4.2.5 *Noise*

With this alternative, potential noise impacts would be reduced as compared to the proposed project. By removing the mixed-use and Village Hotel uses, potential noise impacts from the operation of electrical and mechanical equipment (i.e., ventilation and air conditioning units) would be reduced. As the majority of the site would be developed under this alternative,

noise impacts resulting from construction and operation of construction equipment would be largely the same as that of the proposed project. However, as this alternative would place a large number of residential units adjacent to Carlsbad Boulevard, additional analysis would be required to determine potential noise impacts. Similar mitigation measures would be required to demonstrate that noise levels are reduced to a less than significant level. Therefore, noise impacts under this alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

6.4.2.6 *Traffic and Circulation*

The Increased Residential Use Alternative would generate fewer vehicle trips than the proposed project, due to the proposed residential uses versus the mixed-use or resort-commercial uses, resulting in a decrease in traffic as compared to the project. As the same circulation system is proposed, roadway segments and intersections would likely operate at an improved level of service under this alternative with the reduction in ADT generated. Therefore, impacts to traffic would be reduced with this alternative.

6.4.2.7 *Visual Aesthetics and Grading*

Although impacts to visual aesthetics and grading are not considered to be significant with the proposed project, the Increased Residential Use Alternative would increase such impacts as compared to the proposed project. The construction of residential uses along the coastal bluffs would be inconsistent with the goals of the Local Coastal Program. The Coastal Commission prefers the construction of mixed-use and commercial uses along the coastline, as such uses typically allow for better preservation of existing views across a site. In addition, typical residential development involves the defining of individual lot boundaries with fences or thick landscaping, such as shrubs, to obscure views into one's yard. As a result, views through residential areas are generally limited, as compared to a hotel site, where there may be one large structure, combined with several smaller, independent support structures, with intervening parking as well as public access to the space for views. This pattern of development provides a more open visual environment, allowing views or line-of-sight across the property to be less impacted or restricted as compared to a residential area. On-site development would be subject to the Scenic Corridor Guidelines, similar to the proposed project. With this alternative, the potential for impacts to visual resources would be increased as compared to the proposed project.

6.4.2.8 *Agricultural Resources*

As compared to the proposed project, impacts to agricultural resources would be less than significant. Therefore, impacts to agricultural resources would be the same as compared to the project.

6.4.2.9 *Geology and Soils*

Similar to the proposed project, no significant impacts relating to geologic resources would occur under this alternative. Grading for the proposed uses would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, or increase exposure of residents or visitors to the risk of landslides or earthquakes. As such, potential impacts from geological resources under this alternative would be similar to that of the proposed project.

6.4.2.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

As discussed in Section 5.10, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact on hydrology and water quality. Under this alternative, the area of impervious surfaces would be similar to the proposed project. Required storm water facilities would be adjusted accordingly and would be consistent with the requirements of the Zones 9 and 22 LFMPs. Similar BMPs required for the proposed project would be required under this alternative to ensure that impacts are less than significant, similar to the proposed project.

6.4.2.11 Land Use and Planning

This alternative would include a General Plan Amendment to change the existing General Plan designation to an Area of Special Consideration, similar to the proposed project. This alternative would conflict with the LCP goals of providing visitor serving commercial uses within the coastal zone. Therefore, no impacts related to land use and planning would be greater than the proposed project.

6.4.2.12 Public Utilities and Service Systems

As with the proposed project, this alternative would not result in significant impacts to utilities or service systems. This alternative would implement public utilities consistent with that anticipated in the LFMPs for Zones 9 and 22. While this alternative would result in an increased demand for City administrative, library, parks, fire and school facilities, the project would not in itself necessitate the construction or alteration of these facilities. Therefore, impacts to public utilities and services under this alternative would increase slightly as compared to the proposed project.

6.4.3 Rationale for Preference of Proposed Project over the Increased Residential Use Alternative

This alternative was rejected because it fails to achieve the majority of the project objectives. As the majority of the project site would be developed with residential uses under this alternative, the objective of establishing a mixed-use district that encourages local and tourist-oriented retail, commercial, recreational and residential uses or accommodating a mix of local and tourist-serving commercial, medium-and high-density residential, mixed use, live/work, and open space land use opportunities that are economically viable would not be achieved. This alternative would also not provide expanded and enhanced beach access or provide site design guidelines that require street scenes and site plans to respect pedestrian scale and express a cohesive and high-quality architectural theme. In addition, this alternative would not establish the Southern Coastal Gateway to the City, as no improvements would be made to signify such an entry point. As this alternative would not meet these and other objectives, this alternative is rejected.

6.5 Analysis of the Increased Residential Use / Open Space Alternative**6.5.1 Increased Residential Use / Open Space Alternative Description and Setting**

The Increased Residential Use / Open Space Alternative would result in a large portion of the property being developed with townhomes at a density of 19 du/acre; refer to Figure 6-3. This would allow approximately 316 dwelling units. In addition, a Mixed-Use Center would

be developed in the same location as with the proposed project, and would allow for a variety of commercial retail uses, restaurants, and specialty stores to support the residential and hotel and residential uses. The Hotel/Commercial use would be proposed in the northern portion of the property, although at a smaller scale than compared to that of the proposed project. In addition, this alternative proposes an open space/community park in the southern portion of the property, rather than the Beachfront Resort. The park would be open to the public and would offer opportunities for active and passive recreation, such as walking trails and picnic tables.

6.5.2 Comparison of the Effects of the Increased Residential Use / Open Space Alternative to the Proposed Project

6.5.2.1 *Air Quality*

This alternative would reduce the number of vehicle trips generated to and from the property, as travel/recreation commercial uses would be reduced and a greater number of residential units would be constructed. As a result, air quality impacts would be incrementally reduced as compared to the proposed project. In addition, pollutants generated by operation of construction equipment would be roughly the same as compared to the proposed project, as the development area is assumed to be similar.

6.5.2.2 *Biological Resources*

With this alternative, impacts to biological resources would be reduced as compared to the proposed project. Approximately 12 acres would remain as open space/community park for public use. As the majority of the area that would be used for the park is disturbed habitat or non-native vegetation, impacts would be similar to that of the proposed project; however, an area of Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub (disturbed) occurs in the southwestern portion of the site, which could be avoided by design of the open space/park use. Impacts to biological resources would therefore be reduced with this alternative as compared to the proposed project.

6.5.2.3 *Cultural Resources*

Potential impacts caused by disturbance to undiscovered cultural resources during grading or construction activities would be similar to that of the proposed project, with the exception of the area proposed as open space/community park. Grading for minor improvements for the park may be required; however, the majority of the ground surface would not be disturbed, thereby reducing potential impacts to undiscovered cultural resources. Mitigation in the form of monitoring during grading activities would be required. Therefore, potential impacts to cultural resources would be reduced as compared to the proposed project.

6.5.2.4 *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*

Similar to the proposed project, the existing residential and commercial uses would remain on-site with this alternative. As such, future residents and visitors to the site would be exposed to potentially hazardous conditions such as contaminated soils or chemicals utilized on the site. As such, additional site assessment would be required under this alternative to determine the extent of potential impacts due to the exposure of humans to such conditions.

Therefore, impacts related to hazards and hazardous conditions would be similar to the proposed project under this alternative.

6.5.2.5 *Noise*

Noise impacts would be reduced with this alternative, with the reduction in the proposed resort-commercial and mixed-use land uses, by reducing mechanical equipment needs and commercial and visitor traffic. In addition, the removal of the Beachfront Resort would also reduce traffic noise and noise from daily operations. However, as residential units are proposed adjacent to Carlsbad Boulevard, additional acoustical site analysis would be required as mitigation to determine potential noise impacts on a project-specific basis. Therefore, noise impacts would be reduced with this alternative as compared to the proposed project.

6.5.2.6 *Traffic and Circulation*

This alternative would reduce the number of vehicle trips generated by reducing the intensity of uses and by proposing a greater number of residential units, while reducing commercial and tourism-related activities. The density of townhomes or single-family units would be developed at a similar density as that under the proposed project; however, a larger area would be reserved for such townhome uses under this alternative. As this alternative would keep the on-site circulation system proposed with the project, and would contribute ADT along similar off-site roadways, mitigation measures to reduce impacts would be similar to that of the proposed project, but at a reduced scale, as this alternative would result in fewer trips generated. Traffic impacts would therefore be reduced with this alternative as compared to the project.

6.5.2.7 *Visual Aesthetics and Grading*

Similar to the proposed project, no significant impacts related to visual aesthetics or grading would result from this alternative. Development would be consistent with City grading standards, the Landscape Design Manual, zoning regulations, and the Scenic Corridor Guidelines. The construction of residential uses along the coastal bluffs would be inconsistent with the goals of the Local Coastal Program. The Coastal Commission prefers the construction of mixed-use and commercial uses along to coastline, as such uses typically allow for better preservation of existing views across a site. In addition, typical residential development involves defining individual lot boundaries with fences or thick landscaping, such as shrubs, to obscure views into one's yard. As a result, views through residential areas are generally limited, as compared to a hotel site, where there may be one large structure, combined with several smaller, independent support structures, with intervening parking. The southern portion of the site would not be developed with the Beachfront Hotel and would instead remain as open space/community park. Impacts to landform alteration and visual resources would therefore be similar with this alternative as compared to the proposed project.

6.5.2.8 *Agricultural Resources*

Similar to the proposed project, impacts to agricultural resources would be less than significant. Therefore, impacts to agricultural resources would be the same as compared to the proposed project.

6.5.2.9 *Geology and Soils*

Similar to the proposed project, no significant impacts relating to geologic resources would occur under this alternative. Grading for the proposed uses would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, or increase exposure of residents to the risk of landslides or earthquakes. As such, potential impacts from geological resources under this alternative would be similar to that of the proposed project.

6.5.2.10 *Hydrology and Water Quality*

As discussed in Section 5.10, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact on hydrology and water quality. Improvement of the roadway for on-site circulation would require limited grading as compared to the roadways and building pads proposed with the project, thereby reducing the acreage of impervious surfaces. BMPs would be required with this alternative with the on-site roadway. Impacts to hydrology and water quality would be reduced with this alternative as compared to the proposed project.

6.5.2.11 *Land Use and Planning*

This alternative would include a General Plan Amendment to change the existing General Plan designation to Area of Special Consideration, similar to the proposed project. This alternative would conflict with the LCP goals of providing visitor-serving commercial uses in the coastal zone. Therefore, impacts related to land use and planning would be greater than the proposed project.

6.5.2.12 *Utilities and Service Systems*

Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would not result in a significant impact to utilities or service systems; however, this alternative would result in an increase in demand on public services and facilities, due to the increased residential uses as compared to the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would increase impacts to utilities and public service systems as compared to the proposed project.

6.5.3 *Rationale for Preference of Proposed Project over the Increased Residential Use/Open Space Alternative*

This alternative would reduce impacts to traffic, noise and air quality, as well as impacts to biological resources as compared to the proposed project. In addition, this alternative would achieve the project objectives of assuring that public facilities and services meet the requirements of the Growth Management Plan and that the project conforms with the General Plan, Amended Zone 9 and 22 Local Facilities Management Plans (LFMP), applicable City ordinances, regulations and policies. As Carlsbad Boulevard would be re-aligned, expanded and enhanced beach access would be provided. However, as a plan would not be developed to guide development within the project area, this alternative would not achieve the goals of establishing the Southern Coastal Gateway to the City or providing site design guidelines that

require street scenes and site plans to respect pedestrian scale and express a cohesive and high-quality architectural theme. This alternative would conflict with the stated goals of the LCP to provide visitor-serving commercial uses in the coastal zone. In addition, the alternative would not provide landscape architecture that celebrates the historic past and horticultural heritage of the City, as no design guidelines would be proposed.

6.6 Analysis of the Increased Townhomes / Single-Family Detached Alternative

6.6.1 Increased Townhomes / Single-Family Detached Alternative Description and Setting

The Townhomes / Single-Family Detached Alternative assumes that the project site would be largely developed with townhomes and single-family development at a density of 10 du/acre; refer to Figure 6-4. This would allow for approximately 172 dwelling units within the northern portion of the site. In addition, the Hotel/Commercial uses at the northern end of the property would be developed. A Mixed-Use Center would be developed in the central portion of the site, just north of Avenida Encinas, similar to the proposed project, but at a smaller scale. The Resort Hotel Use would be developed in the southern portion of the site, also similar to the proposed project. This alternative assumes the re-alignment of Carlsbad Boulevard with development of a linear park along the west side of the roadway. On-site road patterns would be the same as the proposed project. No improvements to enhance the State Beach would be proposed with this alternative.

6.6.2 Comparison of the Effects of the Increased Townhomes / Single-Family Detached Alternative to the Proposed Project

6.6.2.1 Air Quality

This alternative would reduce the number of vehicle trips generated to and from the property, as a greater number of residential units would be constructed, and commercial and resort-commercial uses would be reduced as compared to the proposed project. As a result, air quality impacts would be incrementally reduced; however, mobile emissions would still remain above the significance threshold level for criteria pollutants, although impacts would be less than that of the proposed project. Pollutants generated during the operation of construction equipment would be similar to that resulting from the proposed project, as the development footprint would be similar with this alternative.

6.6.2.2 Biological Resources

With this alternative, the development footprint would be largely the same as the proposed project, although the mixture of uses would differ. Similar mitigation measures would therefore be required to reduce impacts to less than significant. Impacts to biological resources would be similar with this alternative as compared to the proposed project.

6.6.2.3 Cultural Resources

This alternative would result in a similar impact to cultural resources as the proposed project. The development footprint would be similar under this alternative, and grading activities would represent the potential for disturbance to undiscovered cultural resources. Therefore, the same resources would potentially be impacted with this alternative and similar mitigation

measures in the form of monitoring would be required to reduce impacts to less than significant.

6.6.2.4 *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*

Implementation of this alternative would result in a similar impact related to hazards and hazardous materials as with the proposed project. Development on the property would expose people to potentially hazardous materials, such as contaminated soils, asbestos and/or lead paint, and other hazardous chemicals, as identified during the initial site assessment. Such materials would need to be properly disposed of and remediated as applicable before development could occur on the site with this alternative. Impacts are similar under this alternative compared to the proposed project. Implementation of mitigation measures similar to that of the proposed project would be required.

6.6.2.5 *Noise*

Noise impacts would be reduced with this alternative, with the reduction in the proposed resort-commercial and mixed-use land uses by reducing mechanical equipment needs and commercial and visitor traffic. However, as residential units are proposed adjacent to Carlsbad Boulevard, additional acoustical site analysis would be required as mitigation to determine potential noise impacts on a project-specific basis. Therefore, noise impacts would be reduced with this alternative as compared to the proposed project.

6.6.2.6 *Traffic and Circulation*

This alternative would reduce vehicle trips generated by reducing the intensity of uses and by proposing a greater number of residential units, while reducing commercial and tourism-related activities. The density of townhomes or single-family units would be developed at a density of 10 du/acre rather than 19 du/acre, as compared to the proposed project. As this alternative would keep the on-site circulation system proposed with the project, and would contribute ADT along similar off-site roadways, mitigation measures to reduce impacts would be similar to that of the proposed project, but at a reduced scale, as this alternative would result in fewer trips generated. Traffic impacts would therefore be reduced with this alternative as compared to the project.

6.6.2.7 *Agricultural Resources*

This alternative would result in a similar, non-significant impact to agricultural resources as compared to the proposed project. The conversion of agricultural land affected by the LCP Mello II would still require payment of fees with this alternative.

6.6.2.8 *Geology and Soils*

As with the proposed project, no significant impacts as the result of geologic conditions on-site would occur with this alternative. Construction design measures to address any geologic concerns on-site, such as landslides or soil erosion would be applied on a project-specific basis. Therefore, potential impacts relating to geologic resources would be similar as compared to the proposed project.

6.6.2.9 Hydrology and Water Quality

Drainage requirements would be similar to that of the proposed project, and would include relocation of the existing on-site storm drain. Best management practices would be implemented to reduce potential water quality impacts to less than significant, similar to those identified for the project. With implementation of BMPs, impacts on water quality would be similar with this alternative as compared to the proposed project.

6.6.2.10 Land Use and Planning

This alternative assumes that a General Plan Amendment would be approved and that the property would be developed under the General Plan designations that would permit a mix of multi-family or single-family residential development. Existing zoning designations would require changes to permit additional residential uses. As no significant impacts on land use and planning were identified with the proposed project, land use and planning impacts would be similar with this alternative as compared to the proposed project.

6.6.2.11 Utilities and Service Systems

As stated in Section 3.6, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact to utilities or service systems; however, this alternative would have an increased demand on public utilities and service systems as compared to the proposed project, as additional residential units would be constructed that would require public water and sewer, as well as public services, such as schools and parks. This alternative also proposes development of the linear park for public recreational use, but park-in-lieu-of fees would be paid as applicable. This alternative would result in an increase demand on school services, but development would not cause a significant impact on such facilities or cause a demand for the construction of new school facilities. Therefore, this alternative would reduce impacts to utilities and public service systems as compared to the proposed project.

6.6.2.12 Visual Aesthetics and Grading

Similar to the proposed project, no significant impacts related to visual aesthetics or grading would result from this alternative. Development would be consistent with City grading standards, the Landscape Design Manual, zoning regulations, and the Scenic Corridor Guidelines. The construction of residential uses along the coastal bluffs would be inconsistent with the goals of the Local Coastal Program. The Coastal Commission prefers the construction of mixed-use and commercial uses along to coastline, as such uses typically allow for better preservation of existing views across a site. In addition, typical residential development involves defining individual lot boundaries with fences or thick landscaping, such as shrubs, to obscure views into one's yard. As a result, views through residential areas are generally limited, as compared to a hotel site, where there may be one large structure, combined with several smaller, independent support structures, with intervening parking. As the development footprint would be similar to that of the proposed project, required grading for this alternative is assumed to be similar. Impacts to landform alteration and visual resources would therefore be similar with this alternative as compared to the proposed project.

6.6.3 Rationale for Preference of Proposed Project over the Increased Townhomes / Single-Family Detached Alternative

The Increased Townhomes / Single-Family Detached Alternative would reduce potential significant impacts to traffic and circulation, as well as incrementally decrease air quality impacts, due to a decrease in the number of trips generated. Noise impacts would also be reduced, due to the reduction of commercial uses. The objectives of assuring that public facilities and services meet the requirements of the Growth Management Plan and conformance with the General Plan, Amended Zone 9 and 22 Local Facilities Management Plans (LFMP), applicable City ordinances, regulations and policies, would be achieved. As individual ownerships would be developed without an overall plan for guidance, this alternative would not establish a mixed-use district that encourages local and tourist-oriented retail, commercial, recreational and residential uses. This alternative would allow for the establishment of a mixed-use district that encourages local and tourist-oriented retail, commercial, and recreational land uses, but at a reduced scale as compared to the proposed project. Improvements to Carlsbad Boulevard would provide additional parking, thereby enhancing access to the State Beach.

This alternative does not meet the project objectives of establishing a Southern Coastal Gateway to the City or accommodating a balanced and cohesive mix of local and tourist-serving commercial, medium- and high-density residential, mixed use, live/work, and open space land use opportunities that are economically viable and support the implementation of these goals. This alternative would conflict with the stated goals of the LCP to provide visitor-serving commercial uses in the coastal zone. In addition, no cohesive architectural theme would be achieved for development of the site. Although this alternative does reduce some adverse impacts associated with the proposed project, it does not result in a substantial reduction in impacts that would make it preferable over another project alternative.

6.7 Analysis of the Increased Townhomes / Visitor Use Alternative

6.7.1 Description and Setting

The Increased Townhomes / Visitor Use Alternative assumes that the project site would be largely developed with a mixture of uses, similar to the proposed project, but with additional residential dwelling units provided; refer to Figure 6-5. In the southern portion of the site, the Resort Hotel use would be developed, similar to the proposed project. An increased number of townhomes would be developed at a density of 19 du/acre as compared to the proposed project, with such uses replacing the Mixed-Use Center. Approximately 281 dwelling units could be developed under this alternative. This alternative would allow for a mixture of commercial uses including retail shops and restaurants. In addition, the Hotel/Commercial use at the northern portion of the site would be developed at a reduced scale, with construction of a neighborhood park at the northernmost portion of the site to provide recreational opportunities and to buffer the hotel use from the adjacent residential neighborhoods. This alternative assumes the re-alignment of Carlsbad Boulevard with development of a linear park along the west side of the roadway. On-site road patterns would be the same as the proposed project. No improvements to enhance the State Beach would be proposed with this alternative.

6.7.2 Comparison of the Effects of the Increased Townhomes / Visitor Use Alternative to the Proposed Project

6.7.2.1 *Air Quality*

This alternative would reduce the number of vehicle trips generated to and from the property, as a greater number of residential units would be constructed, and commercial and resort-commercial uses would be reduced as compared to the proposed project. As a result, air quality impacts would be incrementally reduced; however, mobile emissions would still remain above the significance threshold level for criteria pollutants, although impacts would be less than that of the proposed project. Pollutants generated during the operation of construction equipment would be similar to that compared to that resulting from the proposed project, as the development footprint would be similar with this alternative.

6.7.2.2 *Biological Resources*

With this alternative, the development footprint would be largely the same as the proposed project, although the mixture of uses would differ. Similar mitigation measures would therefore be required to reduce impacts to less than significant. Impacts to biological resources would therefore be similar with this alternative as compared to the proposed project.

6.7.2.3 *Cultural Resources*

This alternative would result in a similar impact to cultural resources as the proposed project. The development footprint and limits of grading would be similar under this alternative, and grading activities would represent the potential for disturbance to undiscovered cultural resources. Therefore, cultural resources not previously identified could potentially be impacted with this alternative, and similar mitigation measures in the form of monitoring would be required to reduce impacts to less than significant.

6.7.2.4 *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*

Implementation of this alternative would result in a similar impact related to hazards and hazardous materials as with the proposed project. Hazardous materials identified on-site during preparation of the Phase I ESA would require further analysis and determination of potentially significant impacts to human health. Removal of such hazardous materials could be required through implementation of mitigation measures similar to that of the proposed project.

6.7.2.5 *Noise*

Noise impacts would be reduced with this alternative, as an increase in residential units would occur, the Village Hotel would be replaced by residential uses, and the live-work neighborhood would not be developed, thereby distancing residential uses from commercial retail uses. In addition, a reduction in noise impacts would also occur, as the need for mechanical equipment and the number of vehicle trips generated would also be reduced. However, townhomes would be constructed adjacent to Carlsbad Boulevard, thereby potentially exposing on-site residents to noise impacts from traffic along the roadway. Additional acoustical site analysis would be required as mitigation to determine potential

noise impacts on a project-specific basis. Therefore, noise impacts would be reduced with this alternative as compared to the proposed project.

6.7.2.6 *Traffic and Circulation*

This alternative would result in a slight reduction in the number of vehicle trips generated per day, as the result of a removal of the Village Hotel and Mixed-Use Center. In addition, the Hotel/Commercial area would be reduced in size, to allow for provision of the neighborhood park. On-site circulation would be similar to that proposed with the project, and ADT generated would result in impacts to similar off-site roadways. Mitigation measures to reduce impacts would therefore be similar to that of the proposed project. Traffic impacts would therefore be reduced with this alternative as compared to the project.

6.7.2.7 *Agricultural Resources*

This alternative would result in a similar, non-significant impact to agricultural resources as compared to the proposed project. The conversion of agricultural land affected by the LCP Mello II district would require payment of fees with this alternative to reduce potential impacts.

6.7.2.8 *Geology and Soils*

No significant impacts as the result of geologic conditions on-site would occur with this alternative. Development of the site would not increase the risk of exposure to any geologic conditions on-site, such as landslides or soil erosion, and design measures would be implemented on a project-specific basis. Therefore, potential impacts relating to geologic resources would be similar as compared to the proposed project.

6.7.2.9 *Hydrology and Water Quality*

This alternative would result in similar drainage requirements as compared to the proposed project, as it is assumed that the amount of impervious surfaces would be roughly the same. Drainage improvements would be provided consistent with the LFMPs for Zones 9 and 22 as applicable. The existing on-site storm drain would be relocated with this alternative. BMPs similar to those proposed for the project would be implemented to reduce potential water quality impacts to less than significant. With implementation of the BMPs, impacts on water quality would be similar with this alternative as compared to the proposed project.

6.7.2.10 *Land Use and Planning*

Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would involve development of the site under an approved GPA that would allow the property to be developed under a General Plan designation of an Area of Special Consideration for commercial/hotel components of the plan. The removal of the mixed-use component of the plan would eliminate uses that would appeal to other city residents or visitors not living or staying within the Vision Plan area. Removal of the mixed-use area would result in reduced coastal access because fewer services for people from outside the Vision Plan area would be available. As with the proposed project, land use and planning impacts would be less than significant. As no significant impacts on land use and planning were identified with the proposed project, land use and planning impacts would be similar with this alternative as compared to the proposed project.

6.7.2.11 Utilities and Service Systems

This alternative would result in an increased demand on public utilities and service systems as compared to the proposed project, due to the increase in housing and permanent population. Residents living in the proposed residential units would place a demand on public sewer and water service, similar to conditions with the proposed project. However, as a greater number of permanent residents would reside on the site, an increased demand for facilities such as schools, fire protection, parks, libraries and City administration facilities would be created. This increased demand would not adversely impact the ability of the City to provide such services, as demonstration of consistency with the Zones 9 and 22 LFMPs for adequate provision of these services would be required prior to development. This alternative also proposes development of the linear park for public recreational use, as well as a small neighborhood park to provide for additional parkland and recreational facilities. The payment of school and park in-lieu-of fees would be required as applicable to reduce potential impacts on public service systems. Overall, this alternative would increase impacts to utilities and public service systems as compared to the proposed project.

6.7.2.12 Visual Aesthetics and Grading

Similar to the proposed project, no significant impacts related to visual aesthetics or grading would result from this alternative. All development would occur consistent with City grading standards, the Landscape Design Manual, zoning regulations for height and setbacks, and the City's Scenic Corridor Guidelines to reduce potential visual impacts and maintain visual resources. As the development footprint is assumed to be similar with this alternative as compared to that required for development of the proposed project, required grading for this alternative is also assumed to be similar. Impacts to landform alteration and visual resources would therefore be similar with this alternative as compared to the proposed project.

6.7.3 Rationale for Preference of Proposed Project over the Increased Townhomes / Visitor Use Alternative

The Increased Townhomes / Visitor Use Alternative would reduce potential significant impacts to traffic and circulation, as well as resultant noise and air quality impacts, as compared to the proposed project. This alternative would meet the objectives of assuring that the provision of public facilities and services would meet the requirements of the Growth Management Plan, prior to development. In addition, conformance with the General Plan, Amended Zone 9 and 22 Local Facilities Management Plans (LFMP), applicable City ordinances, regulations and policies would also be achieved with this alternative. Improvements to Carlsbad Boulevard would also allow for additional parking for the State Beach, providing improved access.

However, as no overall plan would be provided to guide development within the area, and individual ownerships would be developed as desired, a cohesive mix of local and tourist-serving commercial, medium- and high-density residential, mixed use, live/work, and open space land use opportunities that are economically viable would not be achieved. In addition, this alternative would not provide a cohesive architectural theme for development of the site. Similarly, requirements for landscape architecture that would celebrate the historic past and horticultural heritage of the City would not be achieved. Although improvements would be made consistent with the Scenic Corridor Guidelines, this alternative does not specifically

meet the project objective of establishing a Southern Coastal Gateway to the City. The eliminator of the mixed-use component of the plan would remove uses that would appeal to other visitors and residents in the City of Carlsbad. The removal of the mixed-use area would mean fewer services would be available for city residents or visitors from outside the Vision Plan area.

6.8 Carlsbad Boulevard Re-Alignment Alternatives

The Vision Plan includes four alternatives for the realignment of Carlsbad Boulevard; refer to Figures 6-1A and 6-1B. The alignments were largely evaluated for potential effects relative to impacts on biological resources, visual resources, parking, traffic signal operations and bridge requirements; refer to Table 6-2. An analysis was performed to determine the potential benefits of moving the existing northbound/southbound Carlsbad Boulevard lanes either to the west or to the east of their current location.

The re-alignment of Carlsbad Boulevard represents the opportunity to achieve several goals of the Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan and the South Carlsbad Coastal Redevelopment Area Redevelopment Plan. These goals were considered in the evaluation of the following alternatives to determine the potential benefits and adverse impacts of each. The goals are as follows:

Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan

- Provide expanded and enhanced beach access;
- Establish the Southern Coastal Gateway to the City;
- Require landscape architecture that celebrates the historic past and horticultural heritage of the City; and,
- Assure that public facilities and services meet the requirements of the Growth Management Plan.

South Carlsbad Coastal Redevelopment Area Redevelopment Plan (July 2000)

- Develop new beach and coastal recreational opportunities;
- Provide a funding source for the potential re-alignment of Carlsbad Boulevard that will yield excess property that could facilitate expansion of the Carlsbad State Beach campgrounds and other recreational facilities, and/or development of cultural facilities or other public facilities; and,
- Increase parking and open space amenities.

Alternative #1

Alternative #1 envisions shifting the southbound lanes of Carlsbad Boulevard between existing Ponto Road and Avenida Encinas to the east, thereby providing additional space on the west side of the roadway for both on-street parking and an enhanced multi-purpose trail. In relocating the roadway, Alternative #1 would create approximately 0.8 acre along the west side of Carlsbad Boulevard, which could be utilized as a linear public park; refer to Figure 6-1A.

This alternative is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative with regards to the re-alignment alternatives for Carlsbad Boulevard. Approximately 3.0 acres of Disturbed Diegan coastal sage scrub would be impacted in the median between Ponto Drive and Avenida Encinas with this alternative. However, this alternative would retain the existing cypress trees in the median to the south of Avenida Encinas, thereby maintaining a visual natural resource along the roadway.

This alternative would provide 61 diagonal parking spaces and 48 parallel parking spaces along Carlsbad Boulevard for visitors to the State Beach. Traffic improvements would require a complex signal operation at Avenida Encinas, due to the width of the required median (longer time to make turning movements), but similar to the existing condition. This alternative would also retain the existing northbound bridge, but would require construction of a new southbound bridge to implement the grade-separated pedestrian underpass under the roadway.

Potential impacts for this alignment are approximately equal to the proposed project, with the exception of reduced impacts to Disturbed Diegan coastal sage scrub. This alternative would have the same impacts as the proposed project for the other issue areas and would include the same mitigation measures.

This alternative would achieve the Vision Plan's objectives of providing expanded and enhanced beach access and would enable the establishment of a Southern Coastal Gateway to the City. In addition, landscape architecture that celebrates the historic past and horticultural heritage of the City could be applied to further enhance the roadway following re-alignment. With the additional available land created by re-aligning the roadway, this alternative would address the provision of public parks facilities through creation of a linear park for public use and recreation. This alternative would also achieve the goal of the SCCRA Redevelopment Plan to develop new beach and coastal recreational opportunities, and would result in the opportunity for potential expansion of the Carlsbad State Beach campgrounds and other recreational facilities, or development of cultural facilities or other public facilities. Lastly, this alternative would provide additional parking and open space amenities. Therefore, this alternative was not rejected from consideration.

Alternative #2

Alternative #2 is the alignment of Carlsbad Boulevard analyzed as part of the project in the EIR with respect for potential environmental impacts; refer to Figure 3-5, which reflects the same alignment as Alternative #2. Similar to Alternative #1, Alternative #2 envisions shifting the southbound lanes of Carlsbad Boulevard between existing Ponto Road and Avenida Encinas to the east, thereby providing space on the west side for both on-street parking and an enhanced multi-purpose trail. This alternative would create approximately 2.0 acres on the west side of Carlsbad Boulevard north of Avenida Encinas and 1.8 acres on the west side of Carlsbad Boulevard, south of Avenida Encinas. This available land could then be used for a linear public park or for expansion of the South Carlsbad State Beach Campground; refer to Figure 6-1A.

The enhanced Carlsbad Boulevard would accommodate two traffic lanes in each direction, dedicated left turn lanes, Class II bike lanes on both sides, and a landscaped center median. By moving the alignment eastward, land on the west side of Carlsbad Boulevard would be available for the location of community amenities such as a pedestrian underpass under the

Boulevard, additional parking spaces for beach parking, a multi-use trail, and opportunities for beautification of the median. This alignment would allow for a five- to ten-foot wide linear park pathway or sidewalk along each side of the roadway, with parking provided along one side of the road. An eight-foot wide bike lane could also be constructed on both sides of the roadway, with two 12-foot wide travel lanes in either direction, separated by an 18-foot wide landscaped median; refer to Figure 3-7.

In addition, the repositioning of the roadway would provide potential opportunities for the State Parks campground to expand onto land vacated by the re-alignment. The re-alignment of the southbound lanes of Carlsbad Boulevard to the east would align with improvements to the roadway recently completed as part of the Hanover Beach Colony development to the north.

With the re-alignment, the Vision Plan envisions a new access point into the Beachfront Village from Carlsbad Boulevard, approximately midway between Ponto Drive and Avenida Encinas. The intersection would be signalized, and a dedicated left-turn lane along Carlsbad Boulevard southbound lanes would be constructed. This alternative would provide 61 diagonal parking spaces and 48 parallel parking spaces for beachgoers located along the southbound lanes of Carlsbad Boulevard between Ponto Road and Avenida Encinas. A less complex signal operation would be required at Avenida Encinas to improve traffic flow as compared to Alternative #1, due to a standardized intersection (i.e., no wide median). This alternative would also retain the existing northbound bridge, although a new southbound bridge would be required to accommodate lane relocation and to implement the grade-separated pedestrian underpass to the west.

Approximately 3.7 acres of Disturbed Diegan coastal sage scrub would be affected in the median between Ponto Drive and Avenida Encinas. This alternative would potentially disturb approximately 0.6 acre of Southern Coastal Salt Marsh in the median immediately north of the Los Batiquitos Lagoon bridges. In addition, the removal of the existing cypress trees in the median south of Avenida Encinas would be required.

This alternative would achieve the Vision Plan's objectives of providing expanded and enhanced beach access and would enable the establishment of a Southern Coastal Gateway to the City. In addition, landscape architecture that celebrates the historic past and horticultural heritage of the City could be applied to further enhance the roadway following re-alignment. With the additional available land created by re-aligning the roadway, this alternative would address the provision of public parks facilities through creation of a linear park for public use and recreation. This alternative would also achieve the goal of the SCCRA Redevelopment Plan to develop new beach and coastal recreational opportunities, and would result in the opportunity for potential expansion of the Carlsbad State Beach campgrounds and other recreational facilities, or development of cultural facilities or other public facilities. Lastly, this alternative would provide additional parking and open space amenities.

This alternative alignment for Carlsbad Boulevard would allow the project to meet objectives and goals established by the Ponto Vision Plan and SCCRA Redevelopment Plan. Therefore, this alternative was not rejected from consideration.

Alternative #3

Alternative #3 would relocate the southbound lanes of Carlsbad Boulevard to the east, freeing approximately 0.8 acre on the west side of Carlsbad Boulevard for a future public linear park. In addition, re-alignment of the northbound lanes to the west would create approximately 1.2 acres along the east side of Carlsbad Boulevard, north of Avenida Encinas, and 2.2 acres on the east side of Carlsbad Boulevard, south of Avenida Encinas. This acreage would be available for additional development or community amenities; refer to Figure 6-1A.

Approximately 3.7 acres of Disturbed Diegan coastal sage scrub in the median between Ponto Drive and Avenida Encinas would be impacted by Alternative #3. Potential disturbance to approximately 0.6 acre of Southern Coastal Salt Marsh within the median immediately north of the Los Batiquitos Lagoon bridges would also occur with this roadway re-alignment. Similar to Alternative #1, this alternative would require the removal of cypress trees in the median south of Avenida Encinas.

Similar to the other alternatives, an additional 61 diagonal parking spaces and 48 parallel parking spaces would be created with relocation of the Carlsbad Boulevard. A less complex signal operation at Avenida Encinas, as compared to Alternative #1, would be required as a standardized intersection (i.e., no wide median) would be constructed.

This alternative would achieve the Vision Plan's objectives of providing expanded and enhanced beach access and would enable the establishment of a Southern Coastal Gateway to the City. In addition, landscape architecture that celebrates the historic past and horticultural heritage of the City could be applied to further enhance the roadway following re-alignment. With the additional available land created by re-aligning the roadway, this alternative would address the provision of public parks facilities through creation of a linear park for public use and recreation. This alternative would also achieve the goal of the SCCRA Redevelopment Plan to develop new beach and coastal recreational opportunities, and would result in the opportunity for potential expansion of the Carlsbad State Beach campgrounds and other recreational facilities, or development of cultural facilities or other public facilities. Lastly, this alternative would provide additional parking and open space amenities.

This alternative alignment for Carlsbad Boulevard would allow the project to meet objectives and goals established by the Ponto Vision Plan and SCCRA Redevelopment Plan. Therefore, this alternative was not rejected from consideration.

Alternative #4

With Alternative #4, the northbound and southbound lanes of Carlsbad Boulevard between (proposed) Beach Way and Ponto Road would be re-aligned to the east to provide area for a linear public park to the west of the roadway; refer to Figure 6-1B. The existing lane configuration would not be changed with the roadway re-alignment (no additional lanes would be proposed). The re-alignment of Carlsbad Boulevard with Alternative #4 would be designed to connect with the roadway as recently improved with the Hanover Beach Colony development to the north.

To the south of Beach Way, Alternative #4 would re-align Carlsbad Boulevard to the east, consistent with the re-alignment proposed with Carlsbad Boulevard Re-alignment Alternative #1 (see description above). As such, to the south of Beach Way, Alternative #4 would result in the same impacts (and benefits), as those identified for Alternative #1, and are therefore

not re-analyzed with this Alternative; refer to Table 6-2. Mitigation measures for Alternative #4 would also be the same as those required for Alternative #1 for the portion of the Carlsbad Boulevard to the south of Beach Way.

Overall, Alternative #4 would provide 61 parking spaces (60 degrees diagonal) and 48 parallel parking spaces for visitors to the State Beach. No existing parking would be removed with the proposed re-alignment.

As the on-site area through which Carlsbad Boulevard would be re-aligned to the north of Beach Way is currently developed and supports the existing frontage roadway, sensitive resources were not identified within this area. The roadway would be re-aligned wherein the northbound lanes would generally follow the alignment of the existing frontage road, and therefore, construction would occur in an area that is presently disturbed. Therefore, no additional impacts to sensitive resources within this on-site area would result with this alternative. As with Alternative #1, the existing cypress trees within the median would be preserved. No additional significant impacts to other resources within the median were identified with this alternative; refer to Table 6-1. Therefore, potential impacts for this alignment would be approximately the same as the proposed project, and the same mitigation measures would be required.

This alternative would achieve the goal of providing expanded and enhanced beach access by freeing approximately 0.5 acre on the west side of Carlsbad Boulevard for use as a future public linear park, combined with the 0.8 acre created with Alternative #1. This alternative would also achieve the goals to integrate landscape architecture that would reinforce the historic past and horticultural heritage of the City, and would increase open space and parking amenities. In addition, Alternative #4 would allow for establishment of a Southern Coastal Gateway to the City.

As such, this alternative for the re-alignment of Carlsbad Boulevard would meet the majority of goals established for the Ponto Vision Plan and the SCCRA Redevelopment Plan. Therefore, this alternative was not rejected from consideration.

**Table 6-1
Comparison of Project Alternatives**

Impact Category	No Development Alternative	No Project Alternative	Increased Residential Use Alternative	Increased Residential Use / Open Space Alternative	Increased Townhomes / Single-Family Detached Alternative	Increased Townhomes / Visitor Use Alternative	Carlsbad Re-alignment Alternative*		
							Alternative 1	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Air Quality	Lesser	Greater	Lesser	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Biological Resources	Lesser	Similar	Similar	Lesser	Similar	Similar	Lesser	Greater	Similar
Cultural Resources	Lesser	Similar	Similar	Lesser	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Hazards	Lesser	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Noise	Lesser	Greater	Similar	Lesser	Lesser	Lesser	Similar	Similar	Similar
Traffic	Lesser	Greater	Lesser	Lesser	Lesser	Lesser	Similar	Similar	Similar
Visual	Lesser	Greater	Greater	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Agricultural	Lesser	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Geology and Soils	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Hydrology/ Water Quality	Greater	Similar	Similar	Lesser	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Land Use	Lesser	Similar	Greater	Greater	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Public Utilities	Lesser	Greater	Greater	Greater	Lesser	Greater	Similar	Similar	Similar

*Alternative 2 not included because it is analyzed with the proposed project.

Table 6-2
Comparison of Carlsbad Boulevard Re-Alignment Alternatives

FACTOR	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
Additional Vacated Acreage Available for Other Uses	Creates 0.8 acres on west side of Carlsbad Boulevard, available for use as a public linear park.	Creates 2.0 acres on west side of Carlsbad Boulevard north of Avenida Encinas and 1.8 acres on west side of Carlsbad Boulevard south of Avenida Encinas, available for use as a public linear park or potential expanded use for the South Carlsbad State Beach Campground.	Creates 0.8 acres on west side of Carlsbad Boulevard, available to be used as a public linear park. Creates 1.2 acres on east side of Carlsbad Boulevard, north of Avenida Encinas and 2.2 acres on east side of Carlsbad Boulevard, south of Avenida Encinas, available for additional development or community amenities.	Creates 0.5 acres on west side of Carlsbad Boulevard, available for use as a public linear park. South of Beach Way: Creates 0.8 acres on west side of Carlsbad Boulevard, available for use as a public linear park.
Effect on Vegetative Communities	Approximately 3.0 acres of Disturbed Diegan coastal sage scrub to be affected in median between Ponto Drive and Avenida Encinas. Retains cypress trees in median south of Avenida Encinas.	Approximately 3.7 acres of Disturbed Diegan coastal sage scrub to be affected in median between Ponto Drive and Avenida Encinas. Potential disturbance to approximately 0.6 acres of Southern Coastal Salt Marsh in median immediately north of the Los Batiquitos Lagoon bridges. Removal of cypress trees in median south of Avenida Encinas.	Approximately 3.7 acres of Disturbed Diegan coastal sage scrub to be affected in median between Ponto Drive and Avenida Encinas. Potential disturbance to approximately 0.6 acres of Southern Coastal Salt Marsh in median immediately north of the Los Batiquitos Lagoon bridges. Removal of cypress trees in median south of Avenida Encinas.	Approximately 3.7 acres of Disturbed Diegan coastal sage scrub to be affected in median between Ponto Drive and Avenida Encinas. Retains cypress trees in median south of Avenida Encinas.
Parking	Provides 61 parking spaces (60 degree diagonal) and 48 parallel parking spaces.	Provides 61 parking spaces (60 degree diagonal) and 48 parallel parking spaces.	Provides 61 parking spaces (60 degree diagonal) and 48 parallel parking spaces.	Provides 61 parking spaces (60 degree diagonal) and 48 parallel parking spaces.

Table 6-2 continued

FACTOR	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
Traffic Signal Operations	More complex signal operation at Avenida Encinas due to width of median (longer time to make turning movements) but similar to existing condition.	Less complex signal operation at Avenida Encinas, due to standardized intersection (i.e., no wide median).	Less complex signal operation at Avenida Encinas, due to standardized intersection (i.e., no wide median).	Less complex signal operation at Avenida Encinas, due to standardized intersection (i.e., no wide median).
Vehicular Bridges	Retains existing northbound bridge; requires new southbound bridge to implement the grade-separated pedestrian underpass to the west.	Retains existing northbound bridge; requires new southbound bridge to accommodate lanes re-location and to implement the grade-separated pedestrian underpass to the west.	Requires two new bridges – one northbound and one southbound.	Retains existing northbound bridge; requires new southbound bridge to accommodate lanes re-location and to implement the grade-separated pedestrian underpass to the west.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Figure 6-1A
Carlsbad Boulevard Re-alignment Alternatives

BLANK PAGE PLACEHOLDER

Figure 6-1B
Carlsbad Boulevard Alternatives

BLANK PAGE PLACEHOLDER

Figure 6-2
Increased Residential Use Alternative

BLANK PAGE PLACEHOLDER

Figure 6-3
Increased Residential Use / Open Space Alternative

BLANK PAGE PLACEHOLDER

Figure 6-4
Increased Townhomes / Single-Family Detached Alternative

BLANK PAGE PLACEHOLDER

Figure 6-5
Increased Townhomes / Visitor Use Alternative

BLANK PAGE PLACEHOLDER